UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,313	09/12/2003	Kevin Jackman	7429 US	7818

30078   7590   08/10/2007

MATTHEW D. RABDAU
TEKTRONIX, INC.
14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE
P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW)
BEAVERTON, OR 97077-0001

EXAMINER
PENG, FRED H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 May 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed on 05/29/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of

claim(s) 1-12 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the

rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made

in view of Goodman et al (US 6,427,238 B1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

applicant's admitted prior art (Figs. 1 and 2, hereinafter referred as "prior art") in view of Goodman et al

(US 6,427,238 B1).

            Regarding Claim 1, the prior art discloses a method monitoring a nominal cold boot time

for an application from a Multimedia Home Platform (MHP) transport stream comprising the steps

of:

            a) recording a start time for a selected start position in the transport stream (Figs. 1 and

2; Para 20- Para 23);

            The prior art further discloses a finish time to receive the last module and the total time to

determine the nominal cold boot time (Figs. 1 and 2; Para 20- Para 23).

            The prior art is silent about transport stream containing an Application Information Table

(AIT) and steps of :

b) identifying after the selected start position in the transport stream a service having an

Object Carousel and an associated AIT section;

c) receiving a next occurrence after the service in the transport stream of the associated

AIT section for the application;

d) analyzing the associated AIT section to determine a root asset and remaining assets

required by the application;

e) receiving after the associated AIT section in the transport stream a next occurrence of

a module containing the root asset and subsequent occurrences of modules containing the

remaining assets, recording a time of receipt of the last such module as a finish time; and

f) determining the nominal cold boot time by subtracting the start time from the finish

time.

In an analogous art, Goodman discloses transport stream containing an AIT (FIG.3;

Application Directory Module is an AIT; Col 1 lines 49-54) and steps of:

b) identifying after the selected start position in the transport stream a service having an

Object Carousel and an associated AIT section (FIG.3; Col 2 lines 20-44);

c) receiving a next occurrence after the service in the transport stream of the associated

AIT section for the application (Col 2 lines 42-44);

d) analyzing the associated AIT section to determine a root asset and remaining assets

required by the application (Col 2 lines 42-46);

e) receiving after the associated AIT section in the transport stream a next occurrence of

a module containing the root asset and subsequent occurrences of modules containing the

remaining assets (Col 2 lines 46-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the prior art's method to include AIT and steps of: b) identifying after the selected

start position in the transport stream a service having an Object Carousel and an associated AIT

section; c) receiving a next occurrence after the service in the transport stream of the associated

AIT section for the application; d) analyzing the associated AIT section to determine a root asset

and remaining assets required by the application; e) receiving after the associated AIT section in the transport stream a next occurrence of a module containing the root asset and subsequent occurrences of modules containing the remaining assets, as taught by Goodman so that modules required by the applications can be identified before downloading to improve downloading efficiency.

The prior art discloses a start time, an end time, and the cold boot time; but not specifically disclose determining the cold boot time by subtracting the start time from the finish time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determining the cold boot time either by the method of subtracting the start time from the finish time or by adding each individual time for each module together, the results are the same.

Claim 8 is an implementation of the method described in Claim 1 which has been analyzed and rejected.

Regarding Claim 3, the prior art further discloses determining a succeeding nominal cold boot time is repeatable (Figs. 1 and 2; Para 6).

Regarding Claims 4 and 10, the prior art further discloses graphically displaying the nominal cold boot times (Fig.2; Para 20 - Para23).

Regarding Claims 5 and 11, Goodman further discloses detecting incorrect or insufficient AIT information in the AIT section to properly download the application; and outputting a warning signal (Col 10 lines 13-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art's system to include detecting incorrect or insufficient AIT information

in the AIT section to properly download the application; and outputting a warning signal, as taught by Goodman to aid the user for debugging.

Regarding Claims 6 and 12, Goodman further discloses detecting an inability to boot the application because of the incorrect or insufficient AIT information (Col 10 lines 17-22; shut down the set-top box when the directory module is not certified).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art's system to include detecting an inability to boot the application because of the incorrect or insufficient AIT information, as taught by Goodman to aid the user to identify the root cause.

4.   Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art and Goodman et al (US 6,427,238 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Ohkura et al (US 6,347,400).

Regarding Claim 2, the prior art discloses the cold boot time. The prior art and Goodman both are silent about outputting a signal representative of the nominal cold boot time to a user interface.

In an analogous art, Ohkura teaches (Background para 12) the delay in program start time associated with Near Video On Demand (NVOD) is due to the delay in the downloading, or boot time, of the program received from among several channels on the transport stream.

Ohkura further teaches that the expected delay time, until the start time of the next available program, is outputted to a user interface (Ohkura et al, para. 118; Fig. 8/NVOD REGION).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of the prior art and Goodman to include outputting a signal

representative of the nominal cold boot time to a user interface as taught by Ohkura to facilitate

more friendlier user interface during a program downloading.

Claim 9 is an implementation of the method described in Claim 2 which has been

analyzed and rejected.

5.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior

art and Goodman et al (US 6,427,238 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bisdikian et

al (US 6,047,317).

Regarding Claim 7, the prior art and Goodman disclose the cold boot time and

AIT used in Carousel.

Both the prior art and Goodman are silent about modifying the transport stream

by varying an AIT repetition rate in the transport stream to vary the nominal cold boot

time.

In an analogous art, Bisdikian discloses a high repetition rate in the data

receiving like image data can reduce the image access time (Col 2 line 62 – Col 3 line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the combined system of the prior art and Goodman to

include modifying the transport stream by varying an AIT repetition rate in the transport

stream to vary the nominal cold boot time, as taught by Bisdikian so that the system's

transmission capabilities can be fully utilized.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Fred Peng whose telephone number is (571) 270-1147. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday-Friday 09:00-18:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

Fred Peng
Patent Examiner

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600